
AP[®] Japanese Language and Culture

Sample Student Responses and Scoring Commentary

Inside:

Presentation Writing—Compare and Contrast Article

- ☒ **Scoring Guidelines**
- ☒ **Student Samples**
- ☒ **Scoring Commentary**

Question 2: Compare and Contrast Article

6 points

General Scoring Note

When applying the scoring guidelines, the response does not need to meet every single criterion in a column. You should award the score according to the preponderance of evidence.

	1 Very weak	2 Weak	3 Adequate	4 Good	5 Very good	6 Excellent
	Demonstrates lack of competence in presentational writing	Suggests lack of competence in presentational writing	Suggests emerging competence in presentational writing	Demonstrates competence in presentational writing	Suggests emerging excellence in presentational writing	Demonstrates excellence in presentational writing
TASK COMPLETION	- Article addresses prompt only minimally - Lacks organization and coherence	- Article addresses topic only marginally or addresses only some aspects of prompt - Scattered information generally lacks organization and coherence; minimal or no use of transitional elements and cohesive devices	- Article addresses topic directly but may not address all aspects of prompt - Portions may lack organization or coherence; infrequent use of transitional elements and cohesive devices	- Article addresses all aspects of prompt, including expression of preference and reasoning, but may lack detail or elaboration - Generally organized and coherent; use of transitional elements and cohesive devices may be inconsistent	- Article addresses all aspects of prompt, including expression of preference and reasoning - Well organized and coherent, with a progression of ideas that is generally clear; some use of transitional elements and cohesive devices	- Article addresses all aspects of prompt with thoroughness and detail, including expression of preference and reasoning - Well organized and coherent, with a clear progression of ideas; use of appropriate transitional elements and cohesive devices
DELIVERY	- Labored expression constantly interferes with comprehensibility - Errors in orthography and mechanics very frequent or significantly interfere with readability - Minimal use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list - Constant use of register and style inappropriate to situation	- Labored expression frequently interferes with comprehensibility - Errors in orthography and mechanics frequent or interfere with readability - Frequent mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list - Frequent use of register and style inappropriate to situation	- Strained or unnatural flow of expression sometimes interferes with comprehensibility - Errors in orthography and mechanics may be frequent or interfere with readability - May include frequent mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list - Use of register and style appropriate to situation is inconsistent or includes many errors	- Strained or unnatural flow of expression does not interfere with comprehensibility - Errors in orthography and mechanics do not interfere with readability - May include several mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list - May include several lapses in otherwise consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation	- Generally exhibits ease of expression - Infrequent or insignificant errors in orthography and mechanics - Occasional mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list - Consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation except for occasional lapses	- Natural, easily flowing expression - Orthography and mechanics virtually error free - Virtually no mistakes in use of kanji according to AP Japanese kanji list - Consistent use of register and style appropriate to situation
LANGUAGE USE	- Insufficient, inappropriate vocabulary and idioms constantly interfere with comprehensibility - Limited control of grammatical and syntactic structures significantly interferes with comprehensibility or results in very fragmented language	- Insufficient, inappropriate vocabulary and idioms frequently interfere with comprehensibility - Limited control of grammatical and syntactic structures frequently interferes with comprehensibility or results in fragmented language	- Some inappropriate vocabulary and idioms interfere with comprehensibility - Errors in grammatical and syntactic structures sometimes interfere with comprehensibility	- Appropriate but limited vocabulary and idioms - Appropriate use of grammatical and syntactic structures, but with several errors in complex structures or limited to simple structures	- Variety of vocabulary and idioms, with sporadic errors - Appropriate use of grammatical and syntactic structures, with sporadic errors in complex structures	- Rich vocabulary and idioms - Variety of appropriate grammatical and syntactic structures, with minimal or no errors

Score of 0: UNACCEPTABLE—Contains nothing that earns credit

- Mere restatement of the prompt
- Clearly does not respond to the prompt; completely irrelevant to the topic
- Not in Japanese

NR (No Response): BLANK (no response)

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article

Sample: A

今から、日本の映画やテレビを見る時英語で見ることと日本語で見ることを比べてみます。日本の映画やテレビを見る時英語で見ることと日本語で見ることは同じことも違うことがあります。

1つ目の違うことは日本語で見ると、新しい単語を学ぶことができます。話し通して知らない言葉の意味を分かることができるようになります。そして、新しい単語を文に聞いたから、使い方を知ります。

2つ目の違うことは日本語で見たら、キャラクターの本当の感情を分かることができるようになります。日本の映画やテレビにえんそうした人はキャラクターの目的を本当に知っているから、声は感情をひょうげんします。英語でえんそうした人の声は同じ感情をひょうげんすることができません。

3つ目の違うことは外国人は英語で見るとき話を分かりやすいです。日本語で見たら、もちろん知らない単語をよう出ているから、話を時々分かりません。それから、話を全部わかりたい人は英語で見てください。

結論通して、日本の映画やテレビを見る時英語で見ることは簡単ですけど、日本語で見るの方がいいと思います。私は日本語を上手になりたいので、日本の映画やテレビをいつも日本語で見ます。

Sample: B

私一番好きなのはほんえいがはゴジラとういえいがです。これから、トランスレーションがあるのえいがをみたこととトランスレーションがないのえいがをみることをくらべてみます。

だいいちに、両方ともおなじえいがをみていますから、内容はおなじです。たい験はだいたい同じです。

第二に、トランスレーションがあるのえいがをみたことのほうがもっとできます。トランスレーションがない時、アクター話すのスピードがはやいですし、たいていゲースして、とても難しです。

でも、トランスレーションがないのえいがをみたこと、もっと楽しいとおもいます。一所懸命な考える、分かる時の感じる、わくわくとおもいます。

日本語を上手になるのために、たくさんべんきょうするほうがいいとおもいます。わたしの日本語が上手じゃないのに、トランスレーションがないのえいがをみるのほうが好きです。

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)

Sample: C

はじめまして、私は [name of candidate] です。

今日は日本の画がととらすれての日本の画がをはなします。

日本の画がはむずかしです。からくたははまします私は着ます。わからないです。でも、日本の画がは着ますべたです。

とらすれての日本の画がは便利です。私はあとらすれての日本の画がはわかりますです。でも、とらすれての日本の画がは着ますをさたです。

とらすれての日本の画がの方が日本の画がより便利です。

私はアンダスタンドは大切ですだからトラスレとての日本の画がの方が日本の画がよりすきです。トラスレと

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)

Note: Student samples are quoted verbatim and may contain spelling and grammatical errors.

Overview

The Compare and Contrast Article task assesses presentational writing skills by having students write an article for the student newspaper of their sister school in Japan. The prompt, given in English, asks students to compare and contrast watching Japanese movies and/or television programs in Japanese vs. with translation, based on their own experience. Students must identify three aspects of the topic, highlighting similarities and differences. Additionally, they must express their preference, whether for one option, the other, or both, and provide their reasoning. Responses should demonstrate the ability to identify, compare and contrast, elaborate, choose, and explain in presentational writing. Students are expected to use AP kanji, employ a robust vocabulary, and show control over grammatical structures.

Sample: A**Score: 5**

This article demonstrates emerging excellence in presentational writing. It addresses all aspects of the prompt with thoroughness and detail, including expression of preference and reasoning for watching Japanese movies and/or television programs without translations (i.e., 日本の映画やテレビを見る時英語で見ることは簡単ですけど、日本語で見るの方がいいと思います。私は日本語を上手になりたいので、日本の映画やテレビをいつも日本語で見ます). It is well organized and clear with frequent use of transitional elements and cohesive devices such as 今から、1つ目、2つ目、3つ目、and 結論. It generally exhibits ease of expression (e.g., キャラクターの本当の感情を分かることができるようになります). There are no mistakes in usage of AP kanji, and the use of register and style are consistent for the situation except for occasional lapses. The use of grammatical and syntactic structures is appropriate with minimal errors in complex structures (e.g., 見たら should be 見たら ; 新しい単語を文に聞いたから should be 新しい単語を文で聞いたら; 知らない単語をよう出ているから should be 知らない単語がよく出ているから). There are no errors in orthography, and errors in mechanics are insignificant (話し通して should be 話として; 結論通して should be 結論として). This response would receive a higher score if there was more variety of vocabulary instead of basic words (e.g., 暇な時間; 大抵) and grammatical expressions with less sporadic errors to demonstrate command of language.

Presentational Writing: Compare and Contrast Article (continued)**Sample: B****Score: 3**

This response suggests emerging competence in presentational writing. It addresses the prompt directly but may not address all aspects of the prompt, despite including expression of preference (e.g., でも、トランスレーションがないのえいがをみたこと、もっと楽しいとおもいます). Some inappropriate vocabulary interferes with the comprehensibility of the response (e.g., ゲース). Furthermore, errors in orthography and mechanics are frequent and interfere with readability with a presence of hiragana instead of kanji (e.g., にほんえいがは ; たくさんべんきょうするほうがいいとおもいます). The strained and unnatural flow of expression sometimes interferes with comprehensibility (e.g., 第二に、トランスレーションがあるのえいがをみたことのほうがもっとできるです; アクター話すのスピード). Errors in grammatical and syntactic structures also sometimes interfere with comprehensibility (e.g., わたしの日本語が上手じゃないのに should be わたしの日本語が上手じゃないけど ; トランスレーションがないのえいがをみるのほうがすきです should be トランスレーションがないえいがをみるのほうがすきです; わくわくとおもいます should be わくわくします ; 一所懸命な考える should be 一所懸命考えて ; 分かる時 should be 分かった ; とても難しです should be とても難しいです). If the response had included specific phrases to explain reasoning (e.g., もっとできるです could be もっとわかります、わかりやすいです, etc.) along with the line of thought, or shown more variety in vocabulary, the claims would have been clearer, and the score could have been higher.

Sample: C**Score: 2**

This response suggests a lack of competence in presentational writing. It addresses the topic marginally (i.e., 私はアングスタンドは大切ですからトラスレとての日本の画の方が日本の画がよりすきです) with scattered information lacking in coherence, making the points of comparison difficult to identify (e.g., 日本の画がはむずかしです ; とらすれての日本の画がは便利です。でも、とらすれての日本の画がは着ますをさたです). There is minimal to no use of transitional devices (e.g., からくたははまします; 日本の画がは着ますべたです), which makes the response incoherent. Labored expressions (e.g., とらすれての日本の画 ; からくたははまします私は着ます) and errors in orthography are frequent and interfere with readability (e.g., とらすれて ; からくた ; 大切ですから should be 大切です。だから). The usage of inappropriate vocabulary interferes with comprehensibility (e.g., 着ます ; 日本の画), and the limited control of grammatical structures frequently results in fragmented language (e.g., 日本の画がはわかりますです should be 日本の映画はわかります). This response would have earned a higher score if transitional devices, such as まず、それから, were used to organize points of comparison and explanations, as well as better character conversion for katakana words. More demonstration of competence in basic grammar structures would have increased readability of the argument and earned a higher score.